Chairman Wayne Hoffman called the meeting to order at 7:08 p.m. Members present: Monica Love, Bill Hansman, Anthony Pinto, and alternate Amy Brinton. Alternate Robert Wright was absent. Also present: Zoning Officer Georgia Sprenkel, Solicitor John Baranski, Engineers Terry Myers and Karen Wilson, Recording Secretary, and seven citizens.

I. **Minutes**
   
   **Motion** by Love, second by Hansman, to approve the minutes of the meeting of December 2, 2009. All members voted aye; motion carried.

II. **Reorganization**
   
   It was noted that Len Bradley is no longer a member of the Planning Commission; Chairman Hoffman conveyed the Planning Commission’s thanks to Mr. Bradley for his service to the Township. It was also noted that Mr. Wright will move up as a voting member, Amy Brinton will be the first alternate, and a second alternate has not yet been identified.

   **Motion** by Love, second by Hansman, to appoint Wayne Hoffman as Chairman of the Planning Commission for 2010. All members voted aye; motion carried.

   **Motion** by Hoffman, second by Pinto, to appoint Monica Love as Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission for 2010. All members voted aye; motion carried.

   **Motion** by Love, second by Pinto, to appoint William Hansman as Secretary of the Planning Commission for 2010. All members voted aye; motion carried.

III. **Zoning Cases**
   A. None this month.

IV. **Plans**
   A. Weigelstown School – revisions to parking and stormwater
      
      Justin Kuhn was present on behalf of the school district. The district would like to re-surface some parking areas, add some parking spaces, and improve some stormwater drainage issues along Fox Run Road. The proposal was discussed, and Mr. Kuhn noted that they will record the revised pages of the plans, which will supersede the already recorded plan pages.

      **Motion** by Love, second by Hansman, to recommend approval of the revisions. All members voted aye; motion carried.

   B. Brownstone Manor – Phase III, revisions
      
      Marty Dwyer was present with Eric Johnston. Mr. Dwyer is part owner of the Brownstone Manor development. His company/partnership is responsible for Phases 3
and 4, but has agreed to make right some outstanding issues with Phases 1 and 2. Mr. Dwyer noted that the Homeowners’ Association is now formed and has a Board of its own. There are actually two HOAs, one for Phases 1 and 2 and one for Phases 3 and 4. The clubhouse is refurbished and is ready for use, among other improvements.

Mr. Johnston outlined the proposal. They’re proposing a smaller Phase 3, calling it Phase 3A, then 3B. Will the Township permit that? Sure. Lots 92 through 98 are now proposed as duplex lots rather than single-family homes as previously pictured. Dual ingress/egress was discussed. The problem with changing the single-family homes to duplexes is with traffic. There are more driveways associated with the duplexes, a concern for the Township. The applicant picked the “pivotal piece of road” to which to add duplexes. There will be seven more homes if the applicant is permitted to add the duplexes. The concern is safety of pedestrians and motorists alike. Could they locate duplexes on an extension of Brownstone Drive? Mr. Hansman asked if they could start with Phase 3B, get the duplexes in that area, and then keep the single-family section in Phase 3A? Part of the problem is that the improvements are 70% completed near the Phase 3A section. The applicant is trying to make the best use of the existing conditions while moving the project along to bring in some revenue. The other problem is that there’s no second way of entering/leaving the development. The Planning Commission members don’t have a problem with the additional seven duplexes; the problem is the location of the duplexes. The Planning Commission spent quite a bit of time in previous meetings addressing the traffic problems in this area.

Would the Planning Commission be amenable to any sort of waiver on the temporary cul-de-sac length or the trigger for a second entrance? Perhaps 25 homes would be the limit before an emergency entrance/exit is required.

A revised preliminary plan will be re-submitted to the Planning Commission, and then submitted to the Board of Supervisors. Amy Brinton spoke favorably on behalf of Mr. Dwyer and his projects.

Supervisor Shermeyer asked about the length of a temporary cul-de-sac. One marked on the plan is 700’. She advised the Planning Commission to consider the safety factor when considering the temporary cul-de-sac and the feasibility of having a fire truck back up to get out of the cul-de-sac if there’s no second exit. Mr. Myers noted that the street is 36’ which should help. Notes can be added to the plan to bring that to the attention of the proper people.

C. PL 08-15 – Thunderbird Terrace – Land Development Plan

Eric Johnston was present. The plan is to create fee-simple lots on a private street. The applicant has been revising the plan for the past several months, based on input from the staff and suggestions by the Planning Commission at a previous meeting. Phase 1 involves some townhouse units. There’s public sewer to at least part of this development. Phase 2 would include the second means of ingress/egress, some single-family homes and some modular homes. Phase 3 is the area in the back of the development, including some modular homes. Phase 4 would involve a small multi-family area, a cul-de-sac with apartments.

Regarding Fox Run Road, what is the best way to make the required improvements? The applicant wants to make sure that the funding is spent on items
that make sense and which will provide the best options for the most people. What about the sidewalks on the other side of the road? Several simultaneous sidebar conversations were held, with several options for successful sidewalk installations being bandied about. Mr. Johnston feels that sidewalks aren’t necessary on the development side of the road. They’re proposing a pedestrian easement for future use. There was a concern about the sidewalk pieces on the other side of the road and the fairness of having that owner/developer join those portions of sidewalks and not require Mr. Johnston to add sidewalks on his side.

Concerns: the number of driveways onto Fox Run Road; the sidewalk issue.

The applicant is requesting a waiver of the traffic study requirement. The applicant feels that the actual study will be unnecessary, will only reiterate the existing problems; and the funds for this study could be better spent elsewhere.

It was noted that by waiving a traffic study, the Township is not working toward fixing any of the already-identified problems in this area. How about a voluntary traffic impact fee per building permits?

From the audience, Maureen App noted that there are a number of easements that will be private. Could these be identified to make the permitting process easier in the future? Mr. Johnston will see that she has all the information necessary to make her job easier.

D. PL 09-11 – Catherine Small – Blackberry Road; 2-lot subdivision

Clark Craumer was present on this plan. Ms. Small is proposing a 2-lot subdivision to create Lot 2; Ms. Small lives in the existing house on Lot 1. Waivers requested: preliminary plan and cartway width on Blackberry Road. Mr. Hoffman wondered about the “big picture” and Mr. Myers reminded him that the new requirement is for an 11” x 17” enclosure showing the surrounding area, not necessarily shown on the plan. Mr. Craumer will add information to the plan verifying that there are no wells within 100’ on adjacent lots.

Mr. Myers addressed his comments on C. S. Davidson’s letter dated December 23, 2009. Outstanding items: 2, GIS disk, (Section 601.2.A); 5, owner’s signature (Section 501.2.H); 7, Agricultural and Conservation Zones should be designated (Section 501.2.N); 8, show location of on-lot sewer system for Lot 1; provide locations of existing wells on adjacent lots (Section 501.2.O); 13, Planning Module approval (Section 502.2; add PA DEP code number (Section 601.2.L); 17, clear sight triangle with easement is required for each driveway (Section 708.3); 19, rec fees (Section 718.1 and 718.15); 20, since the available sight distance is only slightly longer than the required sight distance, the proposed driveway location for Lot 2 should be marked so that the Engineer can verify that there is adequate sight distance; AND Zoning Item 2, properly label POB on the soil type delineation information.

Motion by Love, second by Hansman, to recommend approval of the waiver requests for Sections 304.2 (preliminary plan) and 704.b (cartway width on Blackberry Road). All members voted aye; motion carried.

Motion by Hansman, second by Love, to recommend approval pending the satisfactory resolution of the following open items as referred to above: 2, 5, 7, 8, 13, 17, 19, 20, and Zoning 2. All members voted aye; motion carried.
V. **Other Business**

Mr. Baranski brought a request from Attorney Rausch for clarification on the conservation-based design section that is in the revised Zoning Ordinance and/or SALDO. After much groaning by the Planning Commission members, the cross-reference was explained to Mr. Baranski's satisfaction. He will deliver the information to Mr. Rausch, complete with its underlying message from the Commission!

Mrs. Sprenkel asked if there are provisions in the revised Zoning Ordinance/SALDO for rebuilding a structure in the Commercial Zone if the existing structure burns down. Mr. Baranski will add a line that the structure can be rebuilt without going to the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mrs. Love asked about the Zoning Hearing Board's denial of Guy Bowers' application for a Variance. He can appeal that decision if he so desires.

**Motion** by Hansman to adjourn because it's his birthday! The meeting adjourned at 9:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie B. Maher,
Recording Secretary